GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

FOREIGN MISSION BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

APRIL 11, 2006

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:30 a.m., Geoffrey H. Griffis, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

GEOFFREY H. GRIFFIS

Chairperson

RUTHANNE G. MILLER Vice-Chairperson

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

JOHN PARSONS

Commissioner (NPS)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY

Secretary

BEVERLY BAILEY

Sr. Zoning Specialist

JOHN NYARKU

Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

SHERRY GLAZER, ESQ.

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

MAXINE BROWN-ROBERTS

									2
			e transo						es
from	the	Public	Hearing	held	on Ap	ril 1	1, 200	06.	

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

AGENDA ITEM PA	AGE
PRELIMINARY MATTERS	8
WARD THREE	
<u>APPLICATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY:</u> 17481 ANC-3F	
On Behalf of the Republic of Hungary:	
ALLISON PRINCE, ESQ. Pilsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman 5450 23rd Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20015	14
On Behalf of the U.S. Department of State:	
RONALD S. MLOTEK, ESQ. Legal Counsel Office of Foreign Missions U.S. Department of State 3501 International Place, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20008 202/895-3501	67
WITNESSES	
IMRE HELYES WILLIAM GEIER ROBERT GOODE DANIEL KLIBANOFF KAREN PERRY	17 34 46 79 82
BARBARA SIMONS BERNARD SUSSMAN	89 98 102
ADJOURN	111

PROCEEDINGS

2 9:48 A.M.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good morning, ladies

and gentlemen, let me call to order our 11th of April

2006 public hearing. Actually, I won't be calling a

public hearing first. For those that are here for our

entire agenda, please note that our first case and our

first organizational matter will be calling to order

My name is Geoff Griffis, Chairperson.

Joining me today is Ms. Miller, the Vice Chair. Also representing the National Capital Planning Commission, is Mr. Parsons -- oh, I'm sorry, representing the National Park Service is Mr. Parsons and the Director of the National Capital Planning Commission, Ms.

Gallagher, is unable to be with us today.

our Foreign Missions BZA. To that let me call us in

I'm going to skip through some of my more boilerplate openings on this so that we can make up a little bit of time and get into this, but there are several very important aspects that I need to go through.

Etherly, our other Board Member, is also unable to be

First of all, all persons that are

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

order, the FMBZA.

with us due to illness.

Mr.

planning to address the Board and provide testimony,
I would ask several things. You will need to fill out
two witness cards. Witness cards are available for
you where you entered the hearing room at the table.
They should also be available for you at the table in
front of us where you will provide that testimony.

Two witness cards go to the Court Reporter, who is sitting to my right on the floor. It's an important aspect. The Court Reporter will be creating the official transcript of our proceedings this morning and throughout the entire day. also being broadcast live in the Office of Zoning website. Attendant to both of those I ask that people turn off all their cell phones and noise-making devices so that we don't have a disruption of our transmission testimony and/or our these proceedings.

The order of procedure for the Foreign Missions BZA is as follows: first, we will hear the statement and the witnesses of the Applicant. Second, we will here Government reports attendant to the application and I will go through the list of those. Third, we will hear reports, recommendations from other public agencies that might have put in analysis of this case. Fourth, we will hear the report of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Advisory Neighborhood Commission. Fifth, we will hear persons in support, and sixth, we will hear persons in opposition. There are time constraints. I won't go through our regulations on that as I don't think we will be touching on the end of our time restraints. I know that we will get through this expeditiously.

However, it is very important for everyone that is here today for the Foreign Missions BZA application to understand that this is not a normal hearing as a variance or special exception as many might be familiar. This is, in fact, a rulemaking and the difference there. what is First οf all, rulemaking, the FMBZA is not a contested case, other cases are before the BZA. Therefore, we will hear persons in support and persons in opposition and However, there are no parties their testimony. established in this case and there is no examination of witnesses in this.

The record will be closed at the conclusion of our hearing today unless, of course, we keep the record open for an inclusion of additional information. We will be very specific if we do keep this record open and what information should come into the record and when it should come into the record. At that point, after receipt of that information, of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

course, it should be known and well understood that the record would be closed at that time.

The Sunshine Act requires that this Board conduct its hearings in the open and before the public. We do and will enter into Executive Sessions from time to time in order to review our files and also perhaps to deliberate on cases. This is in accordance with our rules, regulations and procedure. It's also in accordance with the Sunshine Act.

decision of the Board in The this legislative proceedings must be based exclusively on the record that's created before us today, so we ask that, of course, anything that the Board should deliberate on be put into the record, either orally or in written fashion. We also ask that people present not engage Board Members private conversations while the hearing is going on or while we might be on break or recess. Therefore, we won't give any appearance of receiving information off the record.

Let me say a very good morning to Ms. Bailey with the Office of Zoning, on my left. Mr. Nyarku, who is with the Office of Zoning on my very far left. Mr. Moy, with the Office of Zoning closer to me; Ms. Rose, with the Office of Zoning is with us

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 also. And Ms. Glazer, with the Office of Attorney 2 General. At this time, the Board will hear any 3 4 preliminary matters. Preliminary matters are those which relate to whether a case will or should be heard 5 today, requests for postponements, continuances, 6 7 withdrawals, whether proper or adequate notice has been provided. I ask that you come forward and have 8 a seat at the table in front of us if you have a 9 10 preliminary matter for our attention. Let me ask if 11 the staff is aware of any preliminary matters for the 12 Board's attention in this first FMBZA Case 17481. MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, Members of the 13 14 Board, to everyone good morning. No, the staff does 15 not have any preliminary matters on this first case. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Yes sir. 16 17 MR. WINSTEAD: My name is Frank Winstead. 18 I'm ANC Commissioner 3F-04, 4545 Connecticut Avenue, 19 Apartment 508, Washington, 20008. 20 I have two related matters concerning 21 possible ex parte communications between ANC Commissioner and Chair Griffis. 22 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: In this case? 23 24 MR. WINSTEAD: In Case 17481. 25 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Go ahead.

MR. WINSTEAD: In preparing for this matter, I am ANC 3F-04, I was looking at the email account for our ANC office and I came across an email from Mital Ghandi who is an ANC Commissioner in our ANC, to griffisdc@verizon.net; info@dcozdcgov.org; cc to ANC-3F at juno.com which is our office account and also cc'd to allison.prince@pilsburylaw.com.

The content of the email is "Geoff, good talking to you today. Attached, please find a letter in support of the Hungarian Embassy. I will fax it to the Office of Zoning at 202/727-6072 as per your instructions as well. Thanks, Mital Ghandi, ANC 3F-05."

And then included in that is the actual letter and also there is an attachment and work which brings up a related matter. Should I go into that?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What's the related matter?

MR. WINSTEAD: The related matter is the clarification on where that letter that Commissioner Ghandi submitted actually came from. When I reviewed the attachment in Microsoft Word, you can go into file properties and look at certain information that is not commonly seen when you print out a document. In that properties field I see author Horn Ashley Dale, Horn

A., company, Pilsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman, LLP.

On subsequent pages, there is -- of the properties -- there is a client number, 542016. I just want to bring it to the Board's attention that the letter from Mital Ghandi appears to have actually originated from Pilsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. So the plot thickens.

Let me clarify my role in this as you've brought up an ex parte communication and I hope it doesn't touch on, well, let me clarify. Last week, I forget what the date actually was, was the budget hearings for the Office of Zoning and I understand that the entire staff for most of it was down there. I was on my way to the Wilson Building when my cell phone rang and it was identified as Zoning which I assumed was people here. I picked up the phone and I said "hello" and someone said "I need to speak to the Assistant of Mr. Griffis." I said "well, you must have him because here I am, all in one."

He introduced himself as Mr. Ghandi and starting talking and I'm not familiar with Mr. Ghandi at all and started talking about this case. And I said "I'm not sure why you got to me." He says he called into the Office of Zoning, they passed him

directly through to my cell phone and there I was talking to him. When he indicated that there was some issue between the ANC on this case, he wanted to submit a letter. I said "well, you need to fax that in." I said you can email through, but you've got to fax it in. I think they need a hard copy in order to print this out and make it an actual submission into the record." I said, "that's all we can do. I know that they'll all be back. Why don't you call back to the Office of Zoning" and that's where it was.

How he got my email address, how he got my cell phone number, I'm not sure, except it came from the Office of Zoning. That's the only communication I had. In fact, I was in receipt of this in my -- in the communication of the letter we now have as Exhibit 29 which is in the record.

I'm happy to take any other questions from you or any other participants. I think we need the representative of the Applicant up here also. I can say unequivocally that this hasn't in any way removed my impartiality in this case and I'm perfectly prepared to continue on this case. If there is any inkling that you don't want me to continue on this case, I'd like to hear from everybody on the Board and I'd be happy to not continue on this case. That will

1 obviously make this not possible to continue today. 2 We will set this for a hearing and we will have to 3 check with the schedules of the Director of the NCPC 4 and also Mr. Parsons from the Park Service and 5 hopefully, Mr. Etherly will be over his illness at that point. 6 7 But let me hear from others and we'll get all of this dealt with. 8 9 Ms. Prince? 10 Allison Prince at Pilsbury MS. PRINCE: 11 Winthrop Shaw Pittman, speaking on behalf of the 12 Republic of Hungary. We have no objection whatsoever 13 to your participation in the case. It was clear to me 14 when I read the same letter that Mr. 15 presented that there had been communication that I'm sure you did not invite and I have no question that 16 you are not biased in this matter. 17 18 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Others? Mr. Parsons? 19 MR. PARSONS: Certainly your explanation 20 as to the course of events I see no reason for you to 21 recuse yourself. 22 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would agree. think it was accidental communication and I don't 23 24 perceive any bias of any sort. 25 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'll return to you with

any further questions, position? Would you like me to 1 2 remove myself from this case? Your 3 MR. WINSTEAD: explanation is 4 satisfactory to me. I do wish to make sure that the Board is aware of the other related matter with the 5 origin of the actual letter. Thank you. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Ι think that's 8 understood. Okay. Thank you very much and I 9 appreciate your bringing this to our attention. 10 think the clarification was good. In fact, it had 11 slipped my mind to even mention that. 12 That being said, any other preliminary Anything else we need, Mr. Moy, Ms. 13 matters then? 14 Bailey? 15 MS. BAILEY: No, Mr. Chairman. Very well, 16 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 17 proceed. 18 MS. BAILEY: This is the application and 19 it's of the Republic of Hungary and the number is And it's pursuant to 11 DCMR Section 1002.1 20 17481. 21 and 206(b)(2)(B) of the Foreign Missions Act, to 22 expand and renovate an existing chancery building in 23 the R-1-A and R-5-D Districts at premises 3900 Shoemaker Street, N.W., Square 2231; and 2950 Linnean 24 25 Avenue, N.W., Square 2231, Lot 6.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you, Ms. Prince.

MS. PRINCE: Good morning, Chairman Griffis and Members of the FMBZA. I'm Allison Prince of Pilsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman. And I'm here today on behalf of the Republic of Hungary. I am here with Imre Helyes, head of the Consular Section for the Embassy of the Republic of Hungary; Lazlo Kovari, the Finance Minister; Alexander Mahey, Assistant to Mr. Kovari; and Nandar Tahetoth, who is an architect and project manager who has come to us today from Hungary.

The plans before you involve the renovation of the existing chancery building and the replacement of another building on the site of the Hungarian Embassy. The new building proposed to replace the existing building will serve both consulate and residential functions.

The entire project will provide the chancery with a vastly improved appearance, modernized space, and will add a relatively small amount of overall square footage of building area to the site.

The existing main chancery building is located in the R-5-D zone. After the chancery was constructed in the mid-1970s, Hungary purchased the single-family house that was located directly adjacent to its existing property. Hungary's site literally

wrapped around the house and therefore its acquisition was logical.

Hungary has used the structure as housing for chancery officials for almost three decades. Hungary now proposed a replacement building on the site that will house the consulate and residential apartments.

While this portion of the site is zoned R-1-A, the vast preponderance of uses in the area are institutional and chancery in nature and the history of the building is single-family use not as The approval of the proposed plans will residential. not result in the conversion of a house to chancery use, since the building has already been used by the chancery for 30 years.

The R-1-A zoned part of the site is also located in the proposed three and slope overlay district that I think Mr. Parsons is especially familiar with. In deference to this proposed overlay, Hungary has reduced the originally proposed amount of impervious surface and introduced a green roof. Also, the landscape plan involves the addition of numerous deciduous trees.

Hungary has been highly sensitive to community concerns. The next-door neighbor, Dr.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Sussman, will benefit from the proposed relocation of all existing rooftop mechanical equipment to the southern end of the building from the northern end of the building. He will also benefit from the landscape buffer that he has requested. The neighborhood, in general, will benefit from the project design, the generous landscape plan and the green roof.

While the ANC has supported the renovation, it has recommended disapproval of the new building. Yet, it has identified no adverse impacts. It simply notes the building's failure to comply with the tree and slope overlay. The ANC report does not acknowledge the high quality design, the green roof, the landscape plan or the dramatic noise reduction for Dr. Sussman.

We urge you to consider all of these factors, as you review this application.

If the Board has no questions, I would like to proceed with the testimony of the first witness, Mr. William Geier of Geier Brown Renfro Architects. I believe that Mr. Geier has been qualified as an expert by this Board before, however, in the event that he has not, I have with me today his résumé. He has almost 30 years of experience in architecture.

I would also like to note that I have
today slightly revised drawings. The drawings include
now the buffer that was suggested by and has now been
provided for Dr. Sussman's residence. The drawings
include some dimensions that were not included in the
set that were in the prehearing statement. And they
also show some adjustments to the imperious surface
area that were made to be consistent with the spirit
and intent of the Forest Hills overlay.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Are we
getting those into the record now, is that correct?
MS. PRINCE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And why don't we take
the résumé also and establish the expert witness,
after review of that.
MS. PRINCE: Actually, I jumped the gun.
I would like the representative from the Hungarian
Embassy to testify before Mr. Geier, Mr. Imre Helyes.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Good
morning.
MR. HELYES: Good morning, ladies and
gentlemen. My name is Imre Helyes. I am a consular
I'm head of the Consular Section of the Hungarian
Embassy at this moment, the most senior diplomat at
the Embassy and that is the Ambassador himself asked

me to represent this institution before the honorable Board.

This application concerns two properties that are currently owned by the Republic of Hungary. The larger of the two properties in 2950 Linnean Avenue, N.W. which is known as Lot 6. It's an L-shaped lot that is the current location of the two-story embassy building that was constructed in the mid-1970s.

The smaller property is located 3900 Shoemaker Street, N.W., and it abuts the larger property on two sides. This property, which is Lot 3, is improved with a small two-story building that is used as housing for Embassy staff. The Republic of Hungary has owned and used the smaller property since 1977. It does not abut any residential property.

The properties are located in the square bounding by Tilden Street, Linnean Avenue and Shoemaker Street. They are located just west of Rock Creek Park, near the intersection of Beech Drive and Pierce Mill Road.

Lot 6 is located in the R-5-D zoned district which was established in the early 1970s as a part of the planned unit development that approved chanceries for the Government, at that time, of

Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Indonesia and Poland. Lot 3 is located in the R-1-A zoned district. The properties are not located in the diplomatic zone, but the surrounding area is largely characterized by diplomatic and institutional users.

Our current building was constructed in the mid-1970s and has not been renovated since that time. The building on Lot 3 also was constructed in the 1970s. We plan to renovate the interior of the existing chancery building in order to modernize our facilities. We also plan a modest 500-square foot expansion that will provide a ceremonial entrance for the chancery.

The exterior of the building will be clad in new materials to provide a cohesive and updated facade. We will continue to use this building as a chancery. We plan to demolish the existing building on Lot 3 and to construct a new building that will feature four residential units for our staff as well as consulate space.

The existing building is dilapidated and unattracted and we plan to replace it with a new building which will harmonize with the renovated chancery and the surrounding area.

The consulate will be located in this

building for security reasons. Under guidelines that govern the chanceries of member states of the European Union, consulates need to be located in a building that is separate from the main chancery building. consulate is a very low-intensity use concerning the movement of clients. It is open only three days a week, Monday, Wednesday and Friday during three hours at each occasion from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. It receives about 8 to 10 visitors per occasion, Americans and The visitors to the consulate foreigners alike. currently use the only secure entrance into the This is not an ideal, far from ideal chancery. situation security standpoint. from

The new building will provide an entirely separate entrance for consulate visitors.

We have tried our best to accommodate the concerns of the community. We have designed the buildings to have the least impact on existing trees son the property. We also reduced the amount of impervious surfacing included in the project by 5 percent. In order to address the community's concerns about the amount of impervious surfacing, we have also redesigned a new building to include a green roof. Our landscape architect has worked with Dr. Sussman, who owns the only residence nearby to provide

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	additional landscaping to screen his property.
2	Our local architect, Bill Geier, has
3	worked with architects from the Republic of Hungary in
4	order to develop a signature design that will
5	compliment the location as well as reflect the unique
6	heritage of our country.
7	We believe this project will result in a
8	complex that is more functional and more aesthetic and
9	we hope that the Board will approve it.
10	Thank you very much for your attention.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you very much.
12	MS. PRINCE: If the Board has no
13	questions, I'd like to proceed with the testimony of
14	William Geier and you should have his résumé there.
15	I would like him qualified as an expert witness.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Good. Do we have any
17	comments or opposition to qualify Mr. Geier as an
18	expert witness in architecture? Not noting any
19	advisory comments, we can establish Mr. Geier as an
20	expert witness.
21	MR. MLOTEK: Mr. Chairman, may I be
22	recognized for a second?
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Certainly.
24	MR. MLOTEK: Thanks. For the record, I'm
25	Ron Mlotek the legal counsel of the Office of Foreign
ı	·

Missions at the U.S. Department of State.

The reason I am interjecting myself at this point is because I noticed that there is no representative here from NCPC. This poses a potential statutory problem to the proceeding because the Foreign Missions Act expressly states by name or by position two federal representatives that must be a part of any Foreign Missions BZA proceeding. One is, of course, the representative of the Secretary of Interior, who is Mr. Parsons; and the other, the act in express terms says "the Executive Director of NCPC."

And my only concern is that we would go through this entire proceeding and then have someone raise an issue that it was not valid or had to be done over. I have a proposed solution to it actually. And that is that rather because we certainly don't want to cause any delay or anything in this proceeding, and it's not likely from where we sit now, we don't see any possibility that anyone could -- would be likely to raise an objection. It's just theoretical possibility at this point.

However, I did notice when I came to the hearing room this morning that Mr. Mann from NCPC is present here somewhere. I said good morning to him

when we passed in the hall and he's here, obviously, for the follow-on cases which are not FMBZA cases. And then, of course, Ms. Gallagher, the Executive Director, could then later read the record and participate in the decision, but I think just to do what can be done to minimize what could threaten or jeopardize any outcome of this proceeding. If Mr. Mann could be found and asked to --CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Take notes? Well, at least to be here. MR. MLOTEK: I mean he is -- he is an official of NCPC. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Believe me, we had a limited time, but we had a quick discussion on this and having Mr. Mann here with us doesn't satisfy the fact that the Director is charged with the member to sit for the FMBZA. In my reading of it and I believe we had a brief opinion on it, it was not required for an entire full Board to proceed, but rather the participants, those positions and chairs to be filled, are named and are specific. So I don't see how Mr. Mann actually satisfies Ms. Gallagher, the Director, not being here. I don't -- I'm open to understanding that we are required to have all five members here, because

that wasn't my reading.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. MLOTEK: Just to clarify my point, Mr. Chairman, we don't take the position that all five members have to be here. I mean a quorum, three, would be sufficient, obviously. However, of the three, let's say we were proceeding with three, two of them would have to be individuals named in the statute. The statute doesn't name the other members -- the other three members of the Board who are, as we know, District government appointees to the Board. But the statute does name specifically. Now we've never had this issue arise. It's never gone to Court. We don't have any judicial ruling on it, but we don't want to have a situation where that is called into question.

And my thinking was that if Mr. Mann was here, I mean he, at least, he is the official designated NCPC representative on behalf of the Executive Director to the BZA in general. And no one doubts his expertise and familiarity with these members. He's not just a body that someone would throw in. He's intimately familiar with issues. He's also very intimately familiar with the Foreign Missions Act. We deal with him all the time on all sorts of issues.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: He's certainly

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Τ	qualified.
2	MR. MLOTEK: So at least if he were here,
3	even though we don't have a piece of paper designating
4	him for this, it would be better than nothing and at
5	least it would strengthen, it would bolster any attack
6	that would later be I notice there's also no
7	Corporation I mean Attorney General. Is there
8	someone from the Attorney General?
9	MS. BAILEY: Yes, there is. She just
10	stepped out momentarily.
11	MR. MLOTEK: Oh.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: She's going to find Mr.
13	Mann.
14	MR. MLOTEK: Oh.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I don't know where she
16	is. She just stepped out.
17	MR. MLOTEK: All right, well, I just
18	thought I would raise that. It's up for the chair to
19	decide.
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Ms. Prince, do you have
21	any opinion on that?
22	MS. PRINCE: I liked Mr. Mlotek's
23	suggestion that Mr. Mann attend the hearing. I
24	believe that Pattie Gallagher can read the record and
25	vote. I certainly don't want to create any kind of

1 issue for an appeal. I suggest you hear from the ANC 2 on the matter. 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Does the ANC have an 4 opinion? You're going to have to come forward and 5 introduce yourself, have a seat at the table. 6 MR. KLIBANOFF: Му name is Daniel 7 Klibanoff, ANC 3-F, Vice Chair. And we would at least, we potentially could have an objection to this 8 and would like to at least hear from the Office of the 9 10 Attorney General before deciding on that, for their 11 interpretation of this. 12 Not being a lawyer, not having had a chance to read through this, I think that would at 13 14 least be fair. 15 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That's fine. I'll see how familiar the designated OAG is with the Foreign 16 17 Missions Act. I think Mlotek is more familiar, perhaps, for his opinion. 18 19 Mr. Parsons? 20 MR. PARSONS: Mr. Chairman, certainly if 21 Mr. Mann was the Acting Executive Director, which he 22 is not, he would be able to slide into this seat 23 without any problem. He is not the Acting Executive Director in Ms. Gallagher's absence and therefore I 24 25 don't think it would be appropriate for him to sit.

1 Ms. Prince stole my idea of we have a 2 standard practice on this Board as well as the Zoning 3 Commission that if a member reviews the record, they 4 can participate in the decision and I think that's the 5 appropriate thing for us to do. It's standard We certainly couldn't make a decision 6 practice. 7 today, but that's fine. Right, I absolutely 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 9 If Mr. Mann was here, it would be, as I said, 10 perhaps facetiously, but with all sincerity, it would 11 be to just take notes. He would not be able to ask 12 questions or speak and quite frankly, I don't see why 13 we would necessarily burden him to do that. 14 get the transcript to Ms. Gallagher and have her 15 participate in deliberation son this. Ms. Miller? 16 17 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I would just like to 18 take one more look at the statute and Mr. Mlotek, do 19 you have that provision with you? I just want to read 20 it one more time. 21 Shall I approach? MR. MLOTEK: 22 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You want to see it? 23 VICE CHAIR MILLER: Yes. 24 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Why don't you 25 hand it to Ms. Miller?

We'll take a minute while she reads it.

(Off the record.)

VICE CHAIR MILLER: Mr. Mlotek, since you are very well versed in this act, I want to ask you, the layers that you talked about performing the functions and one has to go to the function here, could be performed by the NCPC representative reading the record and then voting on it. And my question is is there any requirement with respect to the quorum that the quorum in the FMBZA needs to be comprised of three members, two of which must be federal members? It doesn't go that specific, does it?

MR. MLOTEK: Thank you, Ms. Miller, for the Record, the Department of State has never taken a legal position on what that provision means. And just to make the record clear in this case, I was not asserting a position. I was simply pointing out that given that language that you just read in the Foreign Missions Act, and given the absence of the NCPC Executive Director, a legal question could be raised. I mean that's what lawyers are trained to is, is to spot potential legal issues that could be raised. And if it was raised, it could be raised in such a way as to undermine the validity of whatever outcome this Board arrives at.

2.0

So the Department of State does not have a position. Your reading of it certainly is a very reasonable one and my position now would be if that is the disposition of the Board, then perhaps you should -- I don't know if you could take a vote on it or at least take your positions on the record so that it will be in the record and you know, if in the very unlikely event that it should ever be pursued in some judicial forum, then at least you will, as the administrative tribunal, you will at least have established a record that you acted reasonably, you considered the issue and you came to a reasonable conclusion.

So I do not challenge or question your conclusion, your reading of it.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And you clearly brought up, you haven't brought up a position, but rather brought up the issue and I think having that before us, we now have all gotten copies well dog eared of our Foreign Missions Act. It is very clear in membership, that is required to be constituted in the FMBZA.

There is, in my reading no direct direction, no direct letter indicating what a quorum or how that one would participate. That, I would say,

in consistency with our fashioned procedure we would go back to what creates a quorum for our own constitution of the BZA. And it is very clear and we had this discussion in Executive Session before coming out and we state again that we have a quorum to proceed and to call to session and in fact, make decisions.

I think my position would be and I'd hear from other Board Members that based on the fact to be absolutely cautious that we would provide the record to Ms. Gallagher, the Executive Director of NCPC for her deliberation and participation in the decision of this, on this case.

We are under time constraints also, of course, so we will have to make sure that we can, in fact, meet those. Let me hear from others.

Ms. Miller?

VICE CHAIR MILLER: After taking a look at the statute and listening to the opinions on it, I believe that it could be met by Ms. Gallagher reading the record and then voting on it.

I also just want to throw out the suggestion if perhaps it would give the community more comfort, Mr. Mann is here. If he could just come out here and not participate, but listen.

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think that raises
2	more questions than potential controversies and
3	conflict. The Foreign Missions Act is clear on one
4	important piece, who the members are that sit here.
5	I think that that could actually rise into a level of
6	issue if anyone wanted to make an issue out of it,
7	that why was he participating or even being passing
8	notes to us, funny jokes or not. I don't think we
9	need that to cloud the issue.
10	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Mr. Parsons?
12	MR. PARSONS: I agree.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay, anything else
14	then?
15	VICE CHAIR MILLER: No.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Does anyone disagree
17	with those opinions? Yes?
18	MR. KLIBANOFF: The ANC would at least
19	note that portion read into the record so we're
20	familiar with what it says as we proceed through this.
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What portion?
22	MR. KLIBANOFF: That deals with the
23	membership and who sits.
24	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Who's got the best
25	voice? We can make a copy of it for you and just

1	VICE CHAIR MILLER: The provision that
2	we're address is, it says: "Whenever the Board of
3	Zoning Adjustment is performing functions regarding an
4	application by a Foreign Mission with respect to the
5	location, expansion or replacement of a chancery, (a)
6	the representative from the Zoning Commission shall be
7	the Director of the National Park Service or if
8	another person has been designated under paragraph 1
9	of this subsection, the person so designated; and (b)
10	the representative from the National Capital Planning
11	Commission shall be the Executive Director of that
12	condition."
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And that is Section 406
14	of paragraph i of 22 U.S.C. 406.
15	MR. MLOTEK: 4306.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What did I say?
17	MR. MLOTEK: You said 406.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You're exactly right.
19	MR. MLOTEK: 4306, subsection i.
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I. Okay, anything
21	else?
22	Are you ready for us to proceed?
23	MR. KLIBANOFF: We may have an objection.
24	It sounds like that calls for in the performing
25	functions of this body of the FMBZA

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: It does not. It says
2	that the designated member would be. It has nothing
3	to do with a quorum or functioning a quorum to order
4	or any of the actual procedural functionings of the
5	FMBZA.
6	MR. KLIBANOFF: Okay, we soon may have an
7	objection to that once we can take a better look at
8	it.
9	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just want to clarify
10	that I think that interpretation of that provision is
11	at least the way we're applying it, is performing a
12	function, would be fulfilled by Ms. Gallagher reading
13	the record and voting on the application, as if often
14	the case when a Board Member is absent from a hearing.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Anything else? You had
16	another question?
17	MR. KLIBANOFF: No, that was it.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That was it. Okay.
19	Very well, then I think we're ready to proceed.
20	Ms. Prince, we'll begin with Mr. Geier?
21	MS. PRINCE: Mr. Geier.
22	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Indeed. I'm sorry,
23	one more is Mr. Sussman present? Dr. Sussman? He
24	is, okay. I just wanted to clarify, of course, you
25	put in a request for party status and obviously I hope

1	that you understood in my opening remarks that we
2	don't establish parties in this case, but we will hear
3	from you at the appropriate time when I call for
4	persons to provide testimony.
5	DR. SUSSMAN: Do you have any idea when
6	the appropriate e
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'm sorry, you just
8	need to turn your microphone on.
9	DR. SUSSMAN: Do you have any idea when
LO	the appropriate time would be?
L1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I will call you,
L2	hopefully, it will be in a matter of moments.
L3	DR. SUSSMAN: Okay, because I could
L4	truncate this very simply.
L5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Indeed. Thank you very
L6	much.
L7	Okay, Ms. Prince, let's move ahead then.
L8	MR. GEIER: Good morning, my name is
L9	William Geier. I reside at 5109 Manning Place, N.W.
20	in Washington. I'm the local architect of this
21	project which was designed by a Hungarian architect,
22	A&D Studio. They were selected by the Hungarian
23	government through a design competition in the Year
24	2004.
25	These two Boards that I have up indicate

the site of the project and has already been
described. It's east of Connecticut Avenue off of
Tilden Street overlooking Rock Creek Park. The board
on the right, on the board on the right I have some
photographs which were taken coming down Tilden Street
showing the various embassies that surround the
project as well as Ms. Sussman's house which is
indicated in the lower left-hand photo, Letter E.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Can you point to it in
context in that also?
DR. SUSSMAN: May I be heard?
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: No, well
MR. GEIER: For the record, Mr. Sussman's
house is here.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You're pointing to the
context board and I think the Board can note on the
context board, Mr. Geier is indicated that as listed
it is private residence and it actually shows, this
photograph at Triangle E which is, of course, bonded
to the photograph.
MR. GEIER: Yes. This is Tongo, Tunisia,
Kuwait, Czech Republic.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
MR. GEIER: These two photos, photos L and
M are of the existing building which was built in the

mid-1970s. It's a concrete frame building with exposed concrete floor slabs, otherwise known as spandrels. They're about 18 inches deep. And they are white painted concrete. The spandrel sections are then in-filled with both pre-cast concrete, bush-hammered, kind of ribbed like heavy-duty corduroy in-filled panels and aluminum windows, anodized aluminum windows.

On this lot, number 6, we meet the FAR requirements, the percentage of the lot occupancy and rear yard requirements, but we're seeking a variance for a nonconforming sideyard and a special exception for a setback requirement for the roof structure.

The other lot 3, which as Mr. Helyes explained, was purchased by the embassy in 1977, as an existing two-story wood-framed house, it's about 2700 square feet and it will be replaced, demolished and replaced with a new building, three stories, about 8800 square feet. The first floor will be consulate office function and then there would be four residential units above.

On this lot 3, we meet the minimum lot area requirements, percentage of lot occupancy requirements and height requirements, but are seeking variances for rear yard, side yard and parking. Of

1 course, two of these lots are in the diplomatic 2 overlay zone. 3 The site slopes up from the corner of 4 Linnean to Shoemaker Street. 5 This is the low point of the site. Stepping up to the north and to the west. 6 7 Going to site improvements, there are 14 existing trees which will be removed, but they will be 8 9 replaced with 44 new trees. There's an existing chain 10 That's going to be removed and replaced link fence. 11 with a 7-foot high ornamental fence. 12 The new building is separate as Mr. Helyes 13 has explained, because of security regulations as 14 members of the European Union, we've become familiar 15 with these so-called Schengen guidelines and they're not allowed to have the consulate in the same building 16 17 as the chancery. 18 In addition to the Schengen regulations, 19 for separating the consulate, the other reasons for 20 the project were to upgrade the comfort and efficiency of the occupants, really to improve the life safety 21 22 requirements of the building. 23 (Pause.) 24 These are two photos -- is this on? 25 are two photos taken of the existing site on which we've superimposed a perspective of the new building. You can see the site is currently heavily wooded. This is the existing single-family home that will be demolished and this is the concrete frame, pre-cast structure of the existing consulate building behind. This indicates the new building with the consulate on the ground floor, two apartments on either side above.

brought the materials with me this Mr. Helyes explained the reason for the renovation was to bring this building into the 21st century and as members of the European Union, were using modern European and technology. The reason the system is not very familiar in the United States. There are only a handful of buildings built with this It's called the ventilated rain cladding system. screen system. The weather proofing is placed upon the structure and then separated by several inches. There's actual an open airspace in the cladding materials, are not sealed, but rather, there's a small gap so that fresh air can ventilate behind that, come up at the bottom up and through and makes for a more energy-efficient building.

The materials that we'll be using are these two types of Italian porcelain tiles which have a striated effect on the surface, it's got a matte

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

finished, as well as a pre-patina copper material.

And we can see that in these elevations of the new building. This would be the darker gray material. The apartment units being clad in this prepatina copper material. And here, we're hoping especially in the summer months when the trees are in bloom that this building will blend in very well with nature, rather than the shiner copper which takes 20 plus years to form this patina. The building will be built with the patina on the material.

This is an elevation of the renovation of the existing building. One of the architectural features that will be of architectural interest is developing, again, as Mr. Helyes explained, a small, 500 square foot addition on the south side which will be called the protocol entrance and while that has been -- that's a two and a half story space which then becomes part of the new pumphouse and discussions with Dr. Sussman, the existing building has pumphouses now in three locations. The main one here, which his closest to Mr. Sussman's property, another one in the middle and a third one over this mechanical equipment into this central pumphouse which is one of the reasons we're seeking relief that was spread out in the existing and three locations in now it's

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

consolidated. But we can't because of the size of the equipment and we can't meet the setback.

We've also hired an acoustical engineer and he is developing recommendations for how you achieve the aligning of the interior of that penthouse room to further reduce the sound that comes from the noise of the equipment.

And in these perspectives, you can see the new building versus the existing building. We've attended the February and March meetings of the ANC and heard their concerns. One of the things we did at that time was to change the roofs and there are actually three roofs on this building. There's the two roofs over the apartment blocks and then in between the two apartment blocks, there's a hard paved area, landscaped area of terrace for the residences which actually was partially roofed over the ground floor consulate.

So there's a roof, one, two and three in between them. We've changed those from hard surfaces to green roofs. So the original scheme that we presented to the ANC in February had about 65 percent impervious surface on this Lot 3. After talking with them we were able to reduce to about 60 percent by eliminating some of the exterior paving materials

1 which do not reduce the size of the building because 2 the functional requirements of the of 3 requirements of the embassy. But having built green 4 roofs, we actually now have reduced the amount of hard 5 surface material on that lot to 22 percent. It doesn't strictly comply with quote 6 7 impervious materials because the absorbed eventually will still run off, but we have gone from 8 56 percent hard paved to 22 percent hard surface. 9 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent, so on Lot 3, 11 22 percent of the area is? 12 Still hard material. MR. GEIER: 13 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Not green? 14 MR. GEIER: Not green. 15 Right. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: In terms of the heights, the 16 MR. GEIER: 17 existing chancery two stories was 37 feet, 6 inches 18 tall to the penthouse. The new one is a little bit 19 We've increased it about three and a half 20 feet. It's 41 feet high. 21 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: In that area I would 22 it's the enclosure for the HVAC systems and 23 they're taking three locations, putting it into one, 24 surrounding it. A better location you're asserting 25 and you are acoustically dealing with it.

1	There's talk about that there's well,
2	my direct question is where is not meeting the setback
3	requirement?
4	MR. GEIER: In this direction. This is a
5	view looking this way.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Correct.
7	MR. GEIER: Going from Linnean Street. So
8	it does not meet the 1 to 1 on this side. It probably
9	does on the north side, but not on the south side.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I see.
11	MR. GEIER: So in other words, right here.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And on that rendered
13	elevation that you've just pointed to, on the left
14	side of that, that's what you're calling your
15	architectural embellishment that rises up to the front
16	that meets the penthouse structure?
17	MR. GEIER: Yes. Here is actually the
18	entry.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I see.
20	MR. GEIER: It's a ceremonial entrance, a
21	protocol entrance off of Linnean Street. It takes you
22	directly into the ballroom.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So what we have here is
24	the penthouse actually engaging this architectural
25	embellishment which is part of the tower element that

1	defines the entrance to the building?
2	MR. GEIER: Right. And working with the
3	Commission of Fine Arts, the original scheme that the
4	Hungarian architects had proposed was much more
5	exuberant. The Commission of Fine Arts was not happy
6	with that, so we went back with a more simple approach
7	which they approved. And that's this scheme here.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Interesting. Kind of
9	piques my curiosity to see the first.
10	MR. GEIER: More Frank Garrish.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. There it is.
12	Anything else?
13	MR. GEIER: Unless there are question.
14	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm just curious.
15	From what I little I know about green roofs, I
16	understand there are different levels and I'm
17	wondering what level or standard green roof is going
18	to be.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You were wondering if
20	this was a lead certification?
21	VICE CHAIR MILLER: That's what I mean,
22	yes.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I haven't heard any
24	mention of that. Is that any sort of certification
25	that you're looking for in this green roof?

1	MR. GEIER: No, we're not.
2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
3	MR. GEIER: I can get you the technical
4	information on the types of materials and all of that.
5	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I was just curious.
6	Thank you.
7	MR. PARSONS: Is there going to be a
8	presentation by the landscape architect?
9	MS. PRINCE: Yes, there will be. He's
10	next.
11	If there are no further questions about
12	the architecture, we'll proceed with the testimony of
13	Mr. Bob Goode of Stephenson and Goode. He has been
14	qualified as an expert in landscape architecture by
15	many different bodies, but not by this Foreign
16	Missions Board. I do not have his résumé with me. He
17	has 30 years of experience. He's a Fellow in the
18	American Society of Landscape Architects. He
19	graduated from Cornell. He has a master's from
20	Michigan. If there's no objection, I would like him
21	admitted as an expert.
22	MR. PARSONS: No objection.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Any comments,
24	questions? Any objections? Very well, you can
25	proceed. I want to before we move too far away

1 from the architecture, because I didn't want to quash 2 the question I think that was coming about the green 3 roof, but do you want to give a quick description of 4 the functionality of it or why we even care that it is 5 or not? Does this filter water? What does this do for us? 6 7 MR. GEIER: Yes, it does act as a filter and essentially what green roofs do is slow the rate 8 of runoff, but they don't hold water -- it depends on 9 10 the length and intensity of the storm. So it will 11 hold water for a limited period of time, but that's 12 why you cannot count it as totally impervious surface in the technical or civil engineering definition of 13 14 that. 15 Okay, and why we care CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: about pervious/impervious is what you're getting to. 16 As I understand what you're saying is that if you have 17 18 impervious it's black top and all this rain comes down 19 and then it's all going to wash away and it picks up 20 all the oils and the contaminants and pollutants and 21 it dumps it into our rivers. 22 Right. MR. GEIER: 23 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So if we can, this

green roof conceivably will hold water there that will

evaporate back up into the sky.

24

1 MR. GEIER: That's right. 2 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Or perhaps it filters 3 through some stones and cleans up a little bit. 4 Certainly doesn't get our oil drippings from the cars, 5 from the parking lot. MR. GEIER: That's right. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay, interesting. Fascinating description. Follow-up? Anything else? 8 9 Great. Let's move ahead then. 10 MR. GOODE: Good morning. I'm Robert 11 Goode, a principal of the landscape architectural firm 12 of Stephenson and Goode. We practice at 916 Prince 13 in Alexandria, Virginia Street and reside, 14 personally, at 7730 Elber Road in Alexandria, 15 Virginia. I'd like to just very briefly go through 16 17 the landscape plan with you. It involves really two 18 key aspects. One is the removal of some trees on site 19 in order to facilitate the new program and then 20 replacement landscape plan to both augment the site as 21 it stands now and as a replacement for some of those 22 existing trees that we will be removing. This is the landscape plan overall. 23 area in here is known as Lot 6 which is the main 24 25 existing building. Lot 3 is the smaller piece here,

and possibly the one of most concern related to tree removal.

There are some existing trees on site around that house. There's one that was dead and there are several that are close to -- they're sort of characteristic extreme as plant material and in particular some Norway spruce that sit right up on this edge. There is at the corner or close to the corner of Shoemaker and Linnean a large American elm about 39 inches in diameter that we are preserving. In fact, we've changed the plan considerably over time to best protect that particular tree.

In quantifiable terms for Lot 3, which is here, we are removing about 106 total circumference inches of trees, that's in really three trees: two Norway spruce here and then a saucer magnolia that sits right about in here.

For Lot 6, there are some further removal to facilitate this construction between the two buildings. In that case we are removing the total of 230 circumference issues or circumference inches. Again, a combination of older deciduous trees, older evergreen trees, some of which have really become pioneered and are growing very close to the foundation of the building.

In replacement in the development of the landscape plan, we are replacing in total 496, close to 500 circumference inches in landscape material at the time it goes in. The trees are, in general, the deciduous trees will be 5 inches in caliber. The evergreen trees and ornamental trees slightly smaller, around 3 inches in caliber.

I should point out that this particular plan does not fully show the screening -- I take that back. It is over here on this side. I'm looking at it upside down from I usually look at.

There is a line of dense evergreen trees shown between or along the property line between the embassy and Dr. Sussman's house. I did personally meet with Dr. Sussman and walked that boundary to see where the issues were and how we could screen those out. It's actually a fairly simple screening procedure, so that line of trees -- that's what that represents.

We are providing a new line of street trees, both on Linnean and Shoemaker where we have the space and as Mr. Geier mentioned, there is a perimeter ornamental fence as part of the security for the embassy and a new hedge line on that as well in replacement for the existing chain link fence that we

1 are removing. 2 Questions? CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 3 Ouestions? 4 MR. PARSONS: I am not sure which one of 5 you needs to answer this. I don't understand the removal of trees between the two buildings. 6 don't understand the need for a tunnel between these 7 two facilities. They're literally seconds apart from 8 I don't know whether the tunnel is 9 one another. what's causing the removal of these evergreen trees 10 11 and I'm looking at a tree removal plan -- I don't see 12 it there now, but I'm sure you have L-102. And the two spruce out near the street are a second question. 13 14 But why is it that all of these trees between the two 15 buildings need to be removed? It looks like terraces and tunnel are the cause of that. 16 17 MR. GOODE: In part, that is being caused by construction and I can't really speak to the 18 19 necessity of the tunnel. It's also a matter of some of those trees 2.0 21 are either pioneer trees or self-established trees 22 that are growing quite close to the existing building. 23 In fact, branched right up against it. 24 MR. PARSONS: Photograph H. MR. GOODE: Yes, photograph H, you can see 25

how close these are on that building. This happens to be the saucer magnolia here that I mentioned and they're right up against the face of that, that building.

There is a slope there that comes down so they're established on that slope and it was our feeling that given the nature of those trees, their location, both now and in the future, it would reasonable to remove those and replace them with a higher level of landscape.

MR. GEIER: I can add. The tunnel is there mainly for security purposes, although it literally is just a few feet away. The only portion of the building that is bullet-proof are the consulate offices, so they wanted a private connection between the two, a secure connection between the two buildings. It's not a very elegant way to approach the building because you'd have to go through the parking garage of the existing building, but it's there for security reasons.

I might also add to the question of the trees that Bob pointed out in photograph H, it's our understanding that those trees were added by the Hungarians before they owned Lot 3. So they were there to buffer the new building from the residential

building when the residential owner was still there. 2 So let's go to the two at MR. PARSONS: 3 the street then, at Shoemaker Street. And why they 4 have to be removed? MR. GOODE: There is a grade issue there that's causing that. They are two of a group of three 6 7 and they are the two lesser of the three. As Bill, as Mr. Geier mentioned, the site does slope up from 8 9 Shoemaker and in the development of this new building, 10 the finished floor is at a level that slightly cuts 11 into the slope there, so we are showing a low 12 retaining wall, but it is enough construction close enough to those trees, that we didn't feel their 13 14 survival was terribly likely. 15 MR. PARSONS: You moved the path which was on top of the elm tree roots previously to this side. 16 MR. GOODE: 17 Yes. 18 MR. PARSONS: Why is it necessary for the 19 path to go to this corner of the building now when it 2.0 went to the other corner? MR. GOODE: The reason first and foremost 21 22 was to remove construction as far away from that 23 existing elm as we could if we placed a fairly high We have had 24 emphasis on it. It's a very nice tree. 25 evaluated bу an arborist and we had the

1 recommendations for how to best facilitate that 2 survival in the long term. So we moved all of that 3 pavement and all of that development on that corner 4 away from that existing tree. 5 The other issue was the proximity of that entrance, an ADA facility entrance, away from the 6 7 corner of Linnean and Shoemaker. 8 PARSONS: I want to now move to 9 stormwater. We've heard about the green roof, but I 10 see no stormwater plan as to where the water from the 11 site is going. MR. GOODE: Do you want to speak to that? 12 13 MR. GEIER: We are working with A. Morton 14 Thomas and just last week we received their initial 15 survey. There will be a large stormwater structure in between the two buildings. It's not a final design, 16 17 but it's a preliminary plan. I think I may have 18 brought that. 19 MR. PARSONS: Do you know what type? 20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Mr. Parsons, do you 21 bring up the question because you think it might 22 impact the landscape plan, is that correct? MR. PARSONS: Well, I was worried about 23 24 the locatio of it as to whether we were saving trees 25 and then finding we had to remove them later.

1	MR. GEIER: At the moment, it's planned
2	for this location, but that's not final.
3	All I have with me is the existing site
4	survey. I don't have their proposed scheme yet which
5	needs a lot of work.
6	MR. PARSONS: And that would connect to a
7	stormwater system in the street?
8	MR. GEIER: Yes.
9	MR. PARSONS: Existing stormwater system.
10	Okay.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What's the timing on
12	receiving that, do you know?
13	MR. GEIER: The final?
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Or at least a more
15	final.
16	MR. GEIER: We would probably need another
17	month.
18	MR. PARSONS: Well, so will we.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
20	MR. PARSONS: That's all I have.
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you, Mr. Parsons.
22	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm not sure if this
23	is for Ms. Prince or for you, but it looks like in the
24	application it says that a portion of the project
25	would require some deviation from the strict

requirement of the overlay. And I'm wondering does that mean that you're seeking some relief from us with respect to excepting you from some requirement of the overlay? And I'm just wondering if you could highlight that, if that's true and the justification for that? MR. GEIER: I'm going to ask our attorney to speak to that. I can address that. MS. PRINCE: The project, as Mr. Geier described, there are certain ways in which it does not meet the zoning regulations strictly and there are certain ways that it does not meet the proposed Forest Hills overlay, so we're seeking deviations from standards, not technical variance of special exceptions. But in presenting the application to you, we've tried to hold ourselves to that standard so that you can better evaluate. We can go through in great detail the ways in which we don't technically comply, for example, with the Forest Hills overlay. I didn't know if you had specific questions.

VICE CHAIR MILLER: We were just noting that -- I mean I was looking at your application and basically if it's set out there, we don't necessarily need you to repeat it. If there was anything else

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that you wanted to highlight about it, fine.
Otherwise, that's what we'll rely on.
MS. PRINCE: All the deviations are set
forth in the application in detail.
VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay, thank you.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Any other questions?
Very well, let's proceed.
MR. PARSONS: Is that the final witness?
MS. PRINCE: We have one additional
witness, if you need to hear from him. We have a
sound expert who submitted a report and actually made
a presentation to the ANC. His report demonstrates
that through the consolidation and relocation of the
HVAC and other rooftop equipment, the noise at Dr.
Sussman's property line, the northern property line
will be reduced by a minimum of 50 percent.
I am not sure that he in the room right
now if you want to hear from him.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I don't see a need
unless others feel his report is attached here.
MS. PRINCE: It is, it's Exhibit E to our
pre-hearing statement.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay.
Anything else?

1 MR. PARSONS: I did want to ask Ms. Prince 2 a question. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 3 Good. 4 MR. PARSONS: On Lot 3, certainly this kind of structure would not be allowed as a matter of 5 It's essentially a zoning change in my 6 7 estimation. Could you help by arguing that? 8 9 MS. PRINCE: Yes. As you are aware, under the Foreign Missions Act, chancery use is permitted in 10 11 the mixed-use diplomatic districts and high-density 12 residential districts and then other neighborhoods 13 this Board determines are appropriate that 14 chancery use based on the surrounding uses. 15 I believe that the decision has already been made that this site is appropriate for chancery 16 17 This lot is surrounded on all sides by purposes. 18 either chancery or Park Service property. It's 19 directly across the street from the park and it has 2.0 chancery use literally on three sides. 21 It has been controlled by Hungary for 22 three decades and has been for chancery purposes, 23 essentially by a number of families that live in the 24 house at any given time. 25 I know that there's always concern from this Board about precedent. And I would argue that the history of this particular application is so complex that there should be little concern about precedent. This application could not, for example, be used to argue that an R-1-A zone property in the midst of a Kalorama neighborhood or some other neighborhood automatically now should be considered for chancery use. And the reason is because of the zoning background.

The predominance of the property is located in the R-5-D zone as a result of a PUD that was processed before the Foreign Missions Act even existed. And I believe that when the diplomatic overlay was adopted, this site logically could have been considered as part of the D overlay, but no one would have thought to do it at the time because the property already had R-5-D zoning with the exception of this little corner.

So I believe, based on the zoning history of the property, that nobody really thought about this residual piece and the fact that it would have been appropriate to put in the D overlay.

So because of the PUD history, rezoning the majority of the site, 38,000 feet to R-5-D, the fact that this residual piece, although zoned R-1-A is

surrounded on all sides and is, in fact, surrounded 89 percent by chancery use within 200 feet, chancery or institutional use, the fact that it's been owned by three decades by Hungary and all those factors weigh in favor of your extending chancery use officially to this property.

MR. PARSONS: Now in the PUD, this Lot 3

MR. PARSONS: Now in the PUD, this Lot 3 was not part of that, correct?

MS. PRINCE: Lot 3 was not part of the PUD because at that time the house was owned by a Mr. Eastman, that's why we call it the Eastman house. That's why the buffer was created between the house and the Hungarian Embassy.

However, shortly after the approval of the PUD and the construction of the new building, the property was acquired by the Hungarian Embassy. They didn't go through any process at that point. They began to use it in connection with their purposes. As I said, multiple families have lived in the house. But they've treated it as their own.

And I don't -- it's quite an anomalous situation to have this little residual piece of R-5-A zoning in a sea of R-5-D, but that is, in fact, what we ended up with because of the timing of the acquisition.

2.0

1 MR. PARSONS: So it's not the zoning 2 history as you mentioned before, it's more the use and ownership of the lot. 3 4 MS. PRINCE: Well, it's the zoning history 5 in that -- they're intertwined. Had the Eastman house been owned by the Hungarian Embassy at the time of the 6 7 original PUD, obviously it would have been folded into that application and we would hope would have been 8 9 approved as part οf that PUD. 10 But it was entirely inappropriate to do it at 11 the time, given the fact that it was still owned as a 12 private residence. And then during this whole interim 13 period of 30 years, no new construction was sought on 14 the property, so we have not come before you. 15 I've not seen a case quite like this and I've looked at the other cases that involve the extension of 16 17 chancery use into the R-1 zone, not in the diplomatic 18 overlay and the few times it has been permitted, it 19 appears to have this kind of extenuating surrounding 20 use situation as we have here. 21 MR. Thank you. PARSONS: more 22 question, Mr. Goode. Mr. Goode, you show a hedge and I'm not 23 24 sure what it is. It doesn't make a difference, on the

outside of the fence that's to be erected. Until we

1 get to the front of the new building, on Lot 3, where you show no fence or landscape hedge, as I look at L-2 3 103. 4 MR. GOODE: With one small addition of an The fence line does turn in 5 ornamental tree there. and the front of the building becomes that defensible 6 7 perimeter in that particular case and then picks up 8 again and goes around. 9 The reason there is not much landscape 10 shown there again is out of respect for that existing 11 elm and the feeling that there was not a need for a 12 great deal of it. There is a little bit of it right 13 here in this small gap, if you can see it, and a 14 little bit here, but in general, we wanted to do as 15 little as we could within that particular zone, given the nature of that elm tree. 16 17 MR. PARSONS: So as to -- well, maybe you could go to the image of the photo simulation. That's 18 19 where my confusion was. I meant these here. 2.0 (Pause.) 21 Now unfortunately, the image is blocked by 22 his handsome comfort station in the park, the brick

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

structure in the foreground, but it appears as though

the fence is going across the front of the new

building, but I don't see that in the drawing.

23

24

1 I see it in that drawing, but I don't see it in your landscape drawing. 2 3 MR. GOODE: If you look, you will see that 4 it actually turns in in the front of the building 5 along there is open -- the fence -- it's the way it's The fence actually does cut back in. 6 7 This was, I think, in part also developed 8 around an earlier plan. MR. GEIER: That's before we relocated the 9 10 entrance. 11 MR. PARSONS: Well, what I'm trying to get 12 to is additional screening of this building from the park. I don't see the need to expose it as much as it 13 14 I'm not the architect, obviously, I'm sure a 15 different point of view, but one ornamental tree out in front doesn't seem to provide any screening, if you 16 will, from this frankly startling building that 17 certainly changes the landscape, as you can see in the 18 19 upper photograph. 20 I just ask you to think about that a 21 little more and --22 We'd be glad to. MR. GOODE: Again, I 23 just want to emphasize that this -- you can see it 24 right in the back there, that elm tree is 25 substantial tree and we're trying to do as little as

1	possible right around that, but we can look at the
2	possibility of getting a little bit more screening in
3	there.
4	MR. PARSONS: Certainly, yes.
5	MR. GOODE: That elm is a pretty
6	substantial tree.
7	MR. PARSONS: Oh yes, thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Just for my
9	clarification, your question originally was of this
10	photo montage, you're not seeing the shrub line on
11	those drawings?
12	MR. PARSONS: Not as proposed is my point.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right, okay.
14	MR. PARSONS: If they're surrounding the
15	building with a hedge, on the street face, but when
16	they get to Shoemaker Street facing the park, they
17	don't.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right. Just on the
19	photo because that is what's proposed, correct, just
20	for my understanding? So these are revised now. I
21	see. It broke. I see.
22	MR. GOODE: Yes, the hedge line comes
23	along and then turns in at this retaining wall and
24	then picks up on this side.
25	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Which is shown on L-101
I	I and the second

1	revised which was submitted today.
2	MR. GOODE: That's correct.
3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay, excellent point,
4	Mr. Parsons.
5	Okay, anything else. Clarifications?
6	Questions? Let's proceed.
7	MS. PRINCE: That completes our
8	presentation.
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you very much.
10	Let's move right ahead then. Note that Office of
11	Planning is with us. Let's move to their report.
12	MS. BROWN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and
13	Members of the FMBZA. I am Maxine Brown Roberts,
14	representing the Office of Planning.
15	As has already been established, Lot 6 was
16	placed in the R-5-D zone, along with a number of
17	chanceries in the vicinity via PUD. Chancery use in
18	the R-5-D district is allowed in accordance with the
19	requirements of the Foreign Missions Act and
20	corresponding sections of the zoning regulations and
21	in particular, Section 1002.
22	Regarding Lot 3, which is in the R-1-A
23	district, the appropriateness of a chancery location
24	is determined on a case-by-case basis. Based on the
25	existing uses in the square and in the area, Lot 3

seems to be an appropriate location for chancery as lot and square surrounded by five other embassies or chanceries and the Republic of China's Education Center and one residence.

Regarding the criteria set forth in Section 1002, the Office of Foreign Missions will provide additional information and objectives of the United States to provide adequate and secure facilities to the Republic of Hungary. The property is not within a Historic District, however, proposal was reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts and given conceptual approval with further reviewed delegated staff.

For the existing chancery use, 19 spaces are required and 24 spaces will be provided. The extra four spaces will be dedicated to the residents on Lot 3. The Office of Planning believes that the on-street parking is sufficient to serve a small number of persons that will visit the site and its limited hours of operation.

Regarding the municipal interest, the application is seeking deviation from the side yard, rear yard, parking, roof structure and from the proposed tree and slope overlay.

As stated in our report, the Applicant has

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

demonstrated that reduction in the building envelope of Lot 3 necessitates the reduction in site in rear yards, one on Lot 6, the recladding of the building extends an additional half to a foot into an already reduced sideyard.

As stated before, the reduction in parking on Lot 3 is due to security reasons. The proposed reductions will not affect the neighboring properties because the abutting building is within the same property owner. Reduction in side yards will not affect the light and air of both buildings.

Regarding parking the relatively small numbers of persons who will visit the site, in addition to limited hours of operation will not negatively affect the neighborhood and therefore the intent of the zone plan will be maintained.

Lot 3 is also within the area covered by the proposed Forest Hills tree and slope overlay zone. The small reduction in the side yard requirement will not be detrimental to adjacent building because it has common ownership and the light and the air to the building will not be adversely affected.

To mitigate the increase in impervious surface which is caused by the increase in both lot occupancy in side yard and rear yards, the Applicant

has proposed to provide a green roof on the new building in addition to the use of pervious material in those areas that are paved.

The removal of trees with a circumference of 39 inches will be compensated by planting

of 39 inches will be compensated by planting additional trees on the site. The landscaping plan for the property shows a great increase in the number of deciduous trees and improved landscaping.

The new roof embellishment and roof structure as proposed will house the mechanical equipment that will serve both buildings. The equipment is commonly located in the rear of the building and adjacent resident has requested that it be removed because of the noise which will be reduced in the proposed rooftop location.

The roof structure does not meet the one-to-one setback requirement of Section 411. The roof areas has been reconfigured to accommodate the mechanical equipment and will be unable to meet the one-to-one setback.

The Applicant is therefore combining the roof structure and the architectural embellishment is one feature.

The general purpose and intent of the zoning regulations and map will not be adversely

2.0

1 affected and relocation of the mechanical equipment 2 will help in noise reduction on adjacent properties. The Director of Planning finds that the 3 4 proposed consulate on Lot 3 and improvements on existing chancery on Lot 5 6 are compatible with surrounding uses. The proposal requested deviations 6 will not have a detrimental effect on the nearby 7 residential use. 8 Therefore, the proposal is considered to 9 10 be inadmissable interest subject as it meets the 11 standards established by the zoning regulations. 12 Office of Foreign Missions The will 13 provide additional information on how the federal 14 interest is met in this application. The Office of 15 Planning therefore recommends approval. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 16 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. 17 Thank you for a very thorough report. 18 verv much We do 19 appreciate it, the conclusions and analysis. 20 Is there any question from the Board? Not noting any questions, let's continue. 21 22 Mr. Mlotek? 23 MR. MLOTEK: Thank you very much, 24 Chairman, and may it please his honorable Board. 25 Ron Mlotek, legal counsel for the Office of Foreign Missions of the U.S. Department of State. And I'm very pleased to be here today to represent the Department and the Secretary of State in this proceeding.

I have a number of issues that have to be addressed here. One of them is a procedural type of logistical issue that has to do with the fact that in this case, you probably have noted already, there is no letter, written letter, the customary letter, that comes from my office typically recommending approval and giving our views on the federal criteria among the six criteria that are in the Foreign Missions Act.

I have had discussion with staff about this a couple of day sago and it turns about for reasons we don't understand there appears to have been a change in the normal standard operating procedure that the Office of Zoning uses in requesting, notifying the Department of State of an impending case and requesting our views.

I have, for the record, I can submit -unfortunately I only brought one copy. I ran out of
the office quickly this morning, but I will hand over
to staff a copy of a typical letter. This one goes
back to 2001 that came from the Office of Zoning,
signed by Director Kress. And this letter concerned

1	the chancery of Latvia on Massachusetts Avenue, a case
2	that was handled by Mr. Collins who is also here in
3	the room today.
4	And this letter, which I will be
5	providing, was addressed to our then Deputy Director
6	of the Office of Foreign Missions
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Let me see if I
8	understand the situation here. There was notification
9	that you're asserting has changed as it comes out of
10	the Office of Zoning, so it didn't get to your desk in
11	a timely manner, so that's why we don't have a letter
12	in.
13	MR. MLOTEK: Right.
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I have a little bit of
15	a premonition of this.
16	MR. MLOTEK: Right.
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: In my opening
18	statement, I said we might leave the record open.
19	MR. MLOTEK: Right.
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: For additional
21	information.
22	MR. MLOTEK: Right.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: It seems to me that you
24	would want to submit a letter, is that correct?
25	MR. MLOTEK: If it's felt, if the Board

1	feels that it's necessary and we will also talk to the
2	consulate
3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I don't think that's
4	really necessary, especially
5	MR. MLOTEK: And we will do that for the
6	record.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: The fact that we're
8	going to provide it in the transcript, the entire
9	record to Ms. Gallagher, that would be
10	MR. MLOTEK: But I would also like to
11	request, on behalf of the Department of State, that
12	the staff coordinate with us to have this come in the
13	proper format.
14	The one that we got was addressed simply
15	well, we didn't get it. Staff emailed me a copy of
16	it on Monday or last week, Friday. And it was simply
17	addressed to the Secretary of State.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Interesting.
19	MR. MLOTEK: And so obviously in a 25,000-
20	employee organization, a letter that comes in to the
21	Department of State, it doesn't mention the Office of
22	Foreign Missions anywhere in it. We don't know how
23	the envelope was addressed. We don't have an
24	envelope, so we never got it.
25	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I was under the

1	impression we were a small town.
2	MR. MLOTEK: Well, small town, big
3	government.
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Well, we'll make sure
5	a lunch gets scheduled, food will be provided by the
6	State Department, you all come together and decide how
7	
8	MR. MLOTEK: We'll talk about that.
9	That's within the realm of possibility.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Good.
11	MR. MLOTEK: If there are no untoward
12	appearances involved in that.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: We'll look at the menu
14	and see if we show.
15	MR. MLOTEK: Right. All right, so I will
16	then now verbally just quickly summarize what would
17	have been in the letter for the record and what will
18	be in the record.
19	And that is that the Department of State
20	does strongly recommend a favorable action by this
21	Board on this case and with respect to the criteria
22	for decision in the Foreign Missions Act in 22 U.S.C.
23	Section 4306(d), there are several criteria there that
24	are for the Secretary of State to give her opinion on,
25	we find the following:

One, that favorable action by the Board in this case to permit the Hungarians to do what they would like to do would, in fact, facilitate the international obligation of the United States, as a whole, to facilitate their acquisition of secure facilities for their embassy.

Second, with respect to 4306(d)(3) and (d)(4), there are no special security issues that are raised or necessitated by this proposal or by this chancery at this location. Each one of these cases is reviewed by our security professionals, just for the information of the Board. Each and every case, when we get it, is referred to our colleagues, the Office of Foreign Missions is, in fact, part of the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, and we have colleagues there who are experts on facility protection and they actually go out and review each and every area and each and every proposal. And so they have found there is no special issue that is raised here.

Lastly, with respect to 4306(d)(6), the federal interest, typically, in the past and in this case as well, the federal interest is related to the issue of reciprocity, that is the treatment of United States diplomatic facilities in Hungary. I'm pleased to report that we have until now been fortunate to

have the support of the Hungarian national authorities with all of our various property issues in Hungary. We have every expectation that this will continue in the future and we're sure that favorable action by the Board in this case will, in turn, induce the government of Hungary to be forthcoming.

We do have one upcoming project, I was informed, that concerns one of our annex buildings in Budapest that is used to house the security guard detachment of the Marine Corps. All of our larger embassies have security guard detachments, United States Marines, a small group, that is stationed under the command of a senior Gunnery Sergeant.

And we are looking for another -- to relocate them in Budapest. That would be considered a chancery annex, because they are security personnel. That concludes the findings under the Foreign Missions Act.

Finally, I just want to address the very good issue that Mr. Parsons raised about the zoning and how it relates to the Foreign Missions Act and I believe at one point he stated that in effect this was changing a favorable action by the Board would, in effect, change the underlying zoning at this site. I would like to remind the Board that under the Foreign

Missions Act, no action by the FMBZA, although it is a very powerful body, as you know, the exclusive and preclusive tribunal for reviewing these matters, but still in all, no action by the FMBZA could have the effect of changing zoning, so the zoning would not change, regardless of what the Hungarians would build here with your approval.

To just give you an example, if this were approved and this building on that one lot which was not in the original PUD, were authorized for chancery use, that would not change the zoning so that in the future a non-chancery occupant, let's say, could just move in there. They couldn't. You would have to go through an entire proceeding and that would be pursuant to the very high standards of variances or special exceptions.

Likewise, transfer to another chancery even for -- if the Hungarians -- I mean it's unlikely that in any time in the near future after going through all this expense and trouble, that Hungary is going to move out, but let's just say for example, hypothetically, if 10 years, 20 years, whatever down the road, the embassy should decide to sell all or part or specifically this part that is of concern to some of us here, that one little part that was not

part of the PUD and until now was a residential structure and would be converted to institutional structure, chanceries, and the Embassy of Hungary wished to sell that to another chancery, to another government for use as a chancery, that would likewise have to go before the Board in a regular proceeding, well, a Foreign Missions Act proceeding once again, because it would not be subject to the grandfathering language of the Foreign Missions Act.

The grandfathering provision of the Foreign Missions Act, just to remind everyone, it's a very important point as we're now 23 and a half years away form the enactment of the Foreign Missions Act, getting to the point at which the we're grandfathering provision of the Foreign Missions Act is becoming more and more diluted because so many new chanceries have been built, so many old chanceries have been vacated or left and not continued recycled into chancery use.

Under the grandfathering provision, you do not get any grandfathering right to occupy a chancery which was built or authorized for chancery purposes after 1982. You only -- the only things that are grandfathered are sites that were in chancery use as of October 1, 1982.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So when the FMBZA authorizes either the use of a property in a residential area for chancery use pursuant to the Foreign Missions Act, or the construction, replacement, whatever it is that is being requested of you, and you act favorably upon that and you authorize that action, there is no precedent and no change of zoning that occurs because that decision would be exclusively personal to that government that was the Applicant in the case before you and any other government that would come along down the road would have to go through the whole process again. I just wanted to make that clear.

In addition, aside from this one lot, which wasn't in the PUD, the other parts which surround this lot are, as you heard, zoned R-5-D. And under the Foreign Missions Act, all the areas that are zoned R-5-D and R-5-E are presumptively included within what we come today to call the diplomatic overlay, the act doesn't mention the diplomatic overlay. But is considered to be presumptively appropriate for chancery use. In other words, they don't need -- it would be superfluous to map them even into the diplomatic overlay.

There was some discussion, my colleague, legal counsel for the embassy mentioned that if it had

been mapped today or perhaps different criteria, it would have been mapped within the diplomatic overlay. Possibly so, but to some extent the surrounding area would have been superfluous to map in it, so it's just this one little portion. And it is, let me remind the Board, it is within the same square, it is within the same zoning square as the parts which are in chancery use and which are zoned R-5-D.

So if you did the famous or now infamous one third, two thirds calculation for this square, you would see it would overwhelmingly meet that. So this by no means should this be understood as some sort of grievous departure or injection of a nonresidential use in a residential area because of the configuration of this.

And anyway, my final point, we have been pleased to tell the Board, the Department of State, in conjunction with the National Capital Planning Commission, have been in very active consultation over the years through the Foreign Missions Task Force, along with the Office of Planning, about various ideas of changing the way in which areas are deemed to be appropriate, including, as you know, NCPC is on record, and OP is on record, as not liking the one third, two thirds test. They would like to get rid of

1 it. And in principle, we would be prepared to do that 2 if there were some alternative way to get properties 3 in there. 4 So if we were no longer under the regime 5 of one third, two thirds, this area clearly would be deemed to be appropriate because of the other things 6 7 that are around there. You wouldn't necessarily look 8 at the square. You would look at street frontage. 9 And you would see that the street frontage, completely 10 around this site and across the street is chancery. 11 That concludes my presentation, unless anyone has 12 questions. 13 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Ouestions? 14 (No response.) 15 well, appreciate Very we do that, especially the last monologue, because there wasn't a 16 17 lot of dialogue, but we appreciate the information that was given and with that, it's not new territory 18 19 for the Board, one looking at this, particularly, but 20 also in previous proceedings. 21 Very well. I'll just make note as it's 22 noted throughout the presentation, been 23 course, the other agency that had put in an analysis or review of this was historic and that was under the 24

Commission of Fine Arts.

25

It is Exhibit 25 in the

1	record. It is also mentioned and cited in numerous
2	other submissions with this.
3	That would conclude government agency
4	reports on this. I think we are ready to proceed with
5	the ANC's report.
6	MR. KLIBANOFF: Good morning.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Glad you can still say
8	that.
9	MR. KLIBANOFF: It's getting close to that
10	time, isn't it?
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: It is and we've got a
12	lot more to do, but take your time.
13	(Laughter.)
14	MR. KLIBANOFF: We will try not to exceed
15	the time allotted.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Not to worry.
17	MR. KLIBANOFF: As I know you have some
18	other cases that you would like to hear after us.
19	You should have a copy of our resolution
20	that I am sure that you have reviewed, so I will not
21	dive too much into the minutia of that.
22	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent, it is
23	Exhibit 27 in the record.
24	MR. KLIBANOFF: One point I would like to
25	make up front is the Commission on Fine Arts did not

1 notify the ANC as per statute for their hearing, so we 2 were unable to weigh in on that proceeding. 3 Also, as Mr. Mlotek testified earlier, I 4 guess it sounds like there are no great security 5 concerns with this process, so at least to us that makes us question the need for a tunnel for security 6 7 purposes as part of this application. 8 If there are no great security concerns 9 with it, why would they need to include that which 10 gets to where many of our concerns come which is with 11 the tree and slope overlay. The building of that 12 tunnel is why some of the trees need to be removed. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'm not sure that's on 13 14 point with the review that actually goes through in 15 terms of the FMBZA and the security, rather -- but I 16 think I understand your point. MR. KLIBANOFF: Some of the points that I 17 18 would like to bring up from this, from our resolution 19 is that the impervious surfaces in regards to the R-1-20 A lot which is a separate property from the R-5-D lot, 21

would be increased to 60 percent for that lot which is what is covered by the tree and slope overlay and that does increase, that exceeds what is allowed by the tree and slope overlay by 20 percent.

So when the Applicant speaks as to keeping

22

23

24

with the spirit of the tree and slope overlay, we feel that increasing or exceeding what is allowed by 20 percent is definitely on the large side of that.

Also, in regards to the tree and slope overlay, it does require an arborist to pronounce dead any trees that they feel are damaged and if they are keeping in spirit with that and we can enter photos of this into the record, if you desire. There was a tree is listed on their report as being dead. However, the embassy staff did express to us that it was damaged in a storm, saw a crew that was pruning a tree on one of the adjacent properties and had them come the next morning to remove that tree in its entirety which makes us ask did they have time to have an arborist pronounce that dead between an afternoon and the next morning. And is that truly in keeping with the spirit of the tree and slope overlay?

Just give me one moment to find my next document.

(Pause.)

Let's see here. I just wanted to speak to the fact of Lot 6 which is the current chancery. We do not have any objection to what they are building there. They have addressed all of the concerns that we and the neighborhood have had with regards to the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 noise and the buffering of the properties to that. 2 Where did I put that card? 3 MS. PERRY: While Daniel is looking for 4 his document, I'd like to interject something. Му 5 name is Karen Perry. I'm also from ANC-3F. I think this Board knows over the course 6 7 of many years in our coming here, we've complaining about the amount of institutional use and 8 special exceptions in our neighborhood. 9 10 Now some of those special exceptions are 11 kind of coming back to haunt us. Two thirds, one 12 third, whatever, the two third, one third test with special exceptions that 13 were 14 institutional use in that area, some of which are 15 really one street away on Upton Street or on Rene and not -- they might be in the square, but they're not 16 near the site. 17 I think one of our prime concerns at our 18 19 ANC when we were analyzing this was not Lot 6 where 20 the current embassy is and chancery because that was 21 the embassy and chancery per the 1970 PUDs. 22 Our concern is Lot 3 which is a single-23 family house and all the records I can find in the 24 government do not find -- it might be owned of the 25 government of Hungary, but it was in use as a singlefamily house to anybody's knowledge. So I think our concern is that single-family house and expanding institutional or chancery use in the neighborhood and demolishing a house that we fought hard to get a tree and slope overlay on.

And the building is designed not like the embassies that were limited to the 40 feet and all the requirements of an R-1-A neighborhood. designed to look like an apartment building with the four separate units and from what I understand of the Foreign Missions Act, we have to provide them a chancery and embassy which we have on Lot 6. to provide the ambassador a home, but we do not have to provide staff housing. There's many staff from a lot of embassies living all across the city in every neighborhood. They're in apartment Are we all of a sudden in a They're all over. neighborhood going to take down a house and put up four apartment units?

So part of our concern is the design of this building which does look more like apartments than it does a single family house.

If Hungary was using it before, we had no knowledge of it. It still looked like a single-family house design. So if they had two families in it,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 three, nobody questioned it. But this is basically a single-family neighborhood on Tilden Street around 2 3 It's all townhouses, single-family homes. 4 It's not apartment-building looking. And 5 we are very concerned about the tree and slope overlay. Mr. Parsons will remember the bitter fight 6 7 we had at the Zoning Commission over this overlay which extended probably for a year of hearings, but we 8 9 concerned about the number of are trees, 10 impervious surface and maybe it could be scaled back 11 to address some of those concerns and that's --12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you 13 very much. 14 MR. KLIBANOFF: I have found the document 15 I was looking for. 16 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Indeed. 17 MR. KLIBANOFF: And despite what the 18 lawyer for the Applicant has stated, this would set --19 we feel this would set a precedent for other embassies 20 and chanceries throughout the city who do border 21 neighborhoods, do border who residences and 22 residentially-zoned properties to use this as 23 justification to buy those and to convert them. 24 As the Applicant has said several times, 25 this property has been used for residential use only

up until this point. it has been used for families to live in. So prior use has always been residential, despite whether it's been privately owned or owned by a foreign government.

Also, in regards to the tree and slope overlay, the point of the tree and slope overlay is to or one of the points of the tree and slope overlay is to provide a buffer going into the park, instead of having a sharp dividing line between the park and the residences. And by bringing down these trees, we think that will become more of a sharp dividing and less of sort of a subtle change into the park.

Just some numbers from the tree and slope overlay, according to the tree and slope overlay, you can remove three trees from a property that are more than 12 inches in circumference, as long as none of them are more than 75 inches in circumference. They are removing four trees of a total circumference of 106 inches. The tree and slope overlay does say they can take down 25 percent or less than 25 percent. This 106 inches, according to their arborist numbers, constitutes 53 percent of the circumference inches of this lot.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you.

Anything else? Very good, excellent points. Quite a

few of them, I think we all take great notes on them and we will certainly put them as part of our deliberation.

Let me clarify a couple of things because you started off with the security issue and I just want to clarify the fact the zoning requirements and the chancery use criterion that we look at of course, Mr. Mlotek will cite the Foreign Missions Act, but I cite the zoning regulations, 1001, and I believe it's It speaks to the criterion that we look to and that is the evaluation analysis of whether the State Department can adequately protect this facility. So it's different and in fact, in my quick mind looking at this, it actually reinforces that a tunnel for protection and for security reasons on site supports the fact that they have found that there is no element that has arisen, that they would be concerned about their adequacy to protect this area or this facility. So I think they run hand in hand and are not or I haven't seen anything persuasively put forth in today that they are contrast or contradictory.

Let me investigate a little bit because in all these cases that we hear, and especially this one, particularly today, you've thrown out this sharp

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

dividing line from the park, the tree and slope and the buffer. I'm looking at the board L-101 that's up right now and of course, we have the others, 03. you indicating that this is some -- there is in actual stark contrast of what's being proposed? This is that it will be -- it will just be so clear that this not at all planted and as a buffer to the park? MR. KLIBANOFF: What I'm contending is that part of the reason for the tree and slope overlay is to protect so that this does not happen. could be one step along a road that creates something like that, and the tree and slope overlay, as I said, in one respect, is there so that this does not happen in the protections that it gives. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right, right. Ι understand what the tree and slope overlay does, but what I'm asking you, you've asserted that this harms this particular property and this transition into the park and I'm not seeing that in the illustrations that are presented today, so I'm trying to understand your position. I'm not saying it creates MR. KLIBANOFF: a sharp divide, but it could contribute towards that being created.

I see.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. KLIBANOFF: Because the tree and slope
2	overlay does not want that to happen and if one
3	property is given the exception, other chanceries,
4	embassies that are in that area could use that as
5	precedent and could
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I understand.
7	MR. KLIBANOFF: Because they're protected
8	by it.
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So it's your position
10	that this, as proposed, doesn't create the sharp
11	divide, but opens up the door to someone else creating
12	a sharp divide.
13	MR. KLIBANOFF: Or could contribute as a
14	step or start the domino effect along that road.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I see. Okay.
16	Excellent.
17	There it is. Any other questions?
18	(Pause.)
19	Very well, if there's no other questions
20	of the Board. Thank you all very much.
21	MR. KLIBANOFF: Thank you for your time.
22	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Indeed, we appreciate
23	you being down here and presenting this and also
24	providing your timely report to the Board.
25	At this point, let me call those persons

1 present that would like to provide testimony for the I'm going to call persons in support and also 2 3 persons in opposition, if they would like to come 4 forward and have a seat. I'm going to ask you, of course, to state 5 and address prior to beginning 6 your name 7 testimony and then I'm going to ask you if you would just state on the record that you are in support or in 8 opposition or your position of this and then proceed. 9 10 Excellent. We'll start in the center. 11 MS. SIMONS: My name is Barbara M. Simons. 12 I am here in opposition to the application or part of 13 the application. In other words, we're supporting the 14 ANC, but we also have a separate interest. I'm 15 appearing on behalf of the Forest Hills Citizens Association which is the entity that originally 16 17 sponsored the Forest Hills tree and slope overlay. 18 fact, I was the president at the time it was filed. 19 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You submitted a letter 20 in today, is that correct? 21 MS. SIMONS: Yes. Was it distributed? 22 Yes, that was the question I was going to ask. 23 I did not sign the letter. It's signed by our current 24 president, George Clark. But because I was the

president at the time the Forest Hills tree and slope

1 overlay came into being, and because Mr. Clark 2 couldn't be here today, I was authorized to testify. Perfect. 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 4 MS. SIMONS: Preliminarily, I would like 5 to note something which I'm a little hesitant to do, but past experience has proven that sometimes it's 6 7 better to do it. And that is to express my concern for the procedural irregularity surrounding this case. 8 They were pointed out earlier today. 9 There are at 10 least two procedural irregularities and I am quite 11 concerned about those. 12 I wasn't asked whether I would object or not, but I think I would have. 13 14 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What are the two? 15 First, the fact that there MS. SIMONS: 16 was perhaps an <u>ex parte</u> contact. 17 explained it fairly well, but I'm concerned about ex 18 parte contacts because I was in a case where that turned out to be the issue in the entire case and it 19 2.0 had to be sent back. It was remanded and it had --21 this wasn't a District of Columbia case. 22 federal case, but it was sent back and remanded and we had to start all over from scratch. 23 Indeed. 24 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 25 And the other procedural MS. SIMONS:

irregularity --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I can tell you, I don't like get calls on my cell phone either.

MS. SIMONS: The other one, the more important procedural irregularity is the one that's been pointed out by the State Department. Anyway, I'll move on from there, but I did want to express my concern about those.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.

MS. SIMONS: About the trees, Ι understood the testimony, 14 trees are going to be removed, a total of 14. And they're going to be replaced by smaller trees, 5-inch caliber and 3-inch caliber. One of the things that we had to decide when we were doing up the tree and slope overlay was, was it sufficient simply to plant small trees to replace these large mature trees that are being taken down and we concluded and we had expert testimony in support that taking down mature trees or planting small trees in their place is not exactly an equivalency.

And so when you look at the picture there and I think you said you didn't see the sharp divide between what's there now and going into the park, what you're seeing, I believe, are the trees that are there now. But once you take those big trees down and you

have these little trees, you will see a difference. So I just wanted to point that out, that that is something that you should consider, whether small trees do take the place of large, mature trees.

well, a figure of 22 percent was used in connection with the amount of impervious surface. The 22 percent, as I understood the testimony, was the amount of the reduction from what was originally proposed to what is now being proposed. They're reducing it by 22 percent. But the actual figure of impervious surface, as I understood it, is 60 percent, whereas the tree and slope overlay requires a smaller --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Actually, I think the figure in the application that was submitted is 22 percent of Lot 3 would not be green and so we're perhaps taking percentages of pieces and parts, but I think all of it is in there and forgive me if I brought that up.

MS. SIMONS: No, that's okay. I mean I hope that these points I'm raising will require you or at least encourage you to read the record very carefully. I'm not necessarily complaining about what conclusions you may reach, although maybe I will eventually, but right now, I just want to raise some

1	of these points.
2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Good.
3	MS. SIMONS: The Applicant never asks for
4	an exception to the tree and slope overlay. I want to
5	make it clear that there is a way to ask for an
6	exception.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: But wait a minute, I
8	need to make absolutely clear that you understand that
9	you are now giving testimony as part of the FMBZA, not
10	as a
11	MS. SIMONS: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
13	MS. SIMONS: But
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So it wouldn't be
15	appropriate that under our review and under this
16	scenario
17	MS. SIMONS: Right
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That that would be
19	asked for.
20	MS. SIMONS: Right. What I'm saying is,
21	if there was a problem with the tree and slope
22	overlay, and there is, and I think the Applicant has
23	admitted that they have tried to comply at lest with
24	the spirit. I'm saying there is a way to seek an
25	exception to the tree and slope overlay.

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And what's that way?
2	MS. SIMONS: Well, there is a provision in
3	the tree and slope overlay
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: To come to the BZA for
5	special exception?
6	MS. SIMONS: Exactly.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
8	MS. SIMONS: And there are requirements
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Leave it at that. But
10	that would not be appropriate in this case, but we can
11	
12	MS. SIMONS: No, I'm not saying that you
13	should grant an exception here. I'm saying they
14	didn't comply with the law.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'm not saying granting
16	or not. You said that there's a procedural difficulty
17	and I'm asserting that there is not.
18	MS. SIMONS: Oh, that wasn't the one. No,
19	the procedural difficulties I was referring to were
20	the two that were brought up earlier.
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'm with you. I won't
22	interrupt you again.
23	MS. SIMONS: Okay. No, this is I'm
24	just pointing out that if the Applicant wanted to
25	comply with the tree and slope overlay or the spirit,

1 they could have sought an exception. There is a 2 provision in the overlay to do so, but never did so. 3 That's all I'm -- I'm just pointing that out. 4 And I agree. This is not the forum for There is a forum for the BZA to consider an 5 that. exception. 6 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Understand me, 8 don't understand my point. I probably don't. 9 MS. SIMONS: 10 Perhaps I will have CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 11 someone talk to you about that, but continue on. 12 MS. SIMONS: Okay, okay. Another point I would like to make is that and it's in the testimony, 13 14 but I don't know if you've had a chance to read our 15 testimony, but on the second page of the testimony it points out that in application number 16620, the 16 Embassy of the Republic of Azerbeijan was not allowed 17 to alter the building's residential character. And in 18 fact, they weren't really altering the residential 19 20 character as in this case they are, but they were 21 denied the permission. 22 And then in application 14820, again, the 23 FMBZA denied the application. So it's not like every 24 case, you know, in the past has always been granted

the permission or the application has been granted.

Also, I think that the precedent that would be set here and I think the Applicant said it would not be precedent-setting, but I think it would be, because in Forest Hills, we have at least two other parcels that are very large, 1 million feet each, that's Italy and Peru. And if they -- and those are zoned R-1-A.

If they wanted to do whatever it is, build whatever they wanted under the guise of well, this is a chancery or an embassy, you can imagine what problems because there was a time when Peru was considering selling its property and they were going to build a bunch -- they, whoever brought the property -- was going to build a bunch of townhouses and there was a lot of consternation in the neighborhood. People were very, very upset. Eventually, they did not sell it, but there was that possibility.

Let me see if there was anything else I wanted to cover.

Oh, about the Fine Arts Commission, not only did they not notify the ANC, but I would point out that the Fine Arts Commission doesn't deal necessarily with zoning matters. They deal with design concepts. So the fact that they've approved this design-wise, I don't think necessarily should

control what happens before you. 1 2 Let me see, I think that's it. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. 3 Thank you 4 very much. 5 MS. SIMONS: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I absolutely agree with 6 7 What the Commission of Fine Arts does, does not control us. However, it is part of the review process 8 and it is something that is put into the record and we 9 do review that for their criterion of review as the 10 11 FMBZA is set up and the criterion of our review, one 12 of those portions is historic, as that stepped in 13 historic is not being a Historic District, it is 14 important to us. 15 I appreciate all that you've put in. Ι note that you have submitted in your written statement 16 17 or position and you note several concerns and we will 18 take adequate time to read, review and deliberate on this. 19 2.0 Are there any questions from the Board? 21 VICE CHAIR MILLER: I just have one 22 question and I haven't read your letter yet, I haven't 23 seen that yet, but are you suggesting at all that 24 replacement with the small trees of the large trees

that were taken out is creating some adverse impact on

1	neighboring property?
2	MS. SIMONS: Yes.
3	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Which property is
4	that?
5	MS. SIMONS: I'm talking about the whole
6	neighborhood. The Forest Hills neighborhood. The
7	reason for the tree and slope overlay was to protect
8	the neighborhood, not just particular houses.
9	VICE CHAIR MILLER: I'm looking at the
10	regulations that we were looking at in general, and it
11	talks about "and not adversely affecting neighboring
12	property." And then I know you were talking about,
13	in general, about the intent and purpose of the tree
14	and slope overlay. And so I just wanted to clarify.
15	So your testimony goes to the general intent and
16	purpose as opposed to some specific adverse impact on
17	a property.
18	MS. SIMONS: Yes.
19	VICE CHAIR MILLER: Okay, thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Anything else? Very
21	well, thank you very much. We do appreciate you being
22	here and presenting that. Let's move ahead, Mr.
23	Sussman.
24	DR. SUSSMAN: My name is Dr. Sussman and
25	I think I'm the individual most immediately affected

by the proposed construction. The building which I own is a conversion of a barn which was known as the Pierce Still House. It was converted to a private dwelling by Harry Carr in 1932. It passed through several hands including Sherman Adams, Eisenhower's assistant, at which time Winston Churchill stayed at the house. And I'm interested in preserving the private character of the house and its historical flavor.

Now I am sort of caught at the present time, not between a rock and a hard place, but between the Chinese government, Rock Creek Park, and the Hungarian government. And I don't mind that. What I mind is to preserve my privacy and the value of my property.

Now originally when the Hungarians came along to develop this property, I had missed an opportunity to acquire the whole property. I didn't know, I thought it was parkland and it was acquired by a developer who sold it out in stages, first to Eastman, and then to the Hungarian government.

And when I gave my assent to the Hungarian construction, some 30 years ago, I did it without hesitation and without restriction. Now what I didn't bargain for was the noisy air conditioning equipment

that would be placed at my end of their building that I wouldn't get any significant screening from their structure, and that the elaborate underground drainage system which I didn't know existed, would by being compromised would give me a basement that would require sump pumps in the future, but that's all gone by the board.

What I'm faced with at the present time is something that I've been assured about and I am willing to accept the assurances that are being given me. So I'm withdrawing my objection to this proposed conversion of the building with the understanding that I've been given, the assurance I've been given, that I will have adequate trees planted that will screen me from the present building and from the proposed building and that the air conditioning equipment will be moved from its present unfavorable position to a more distant site where I won't be troubled by it and that the only thing that I would have as a residual concern was how much did all this affect my property value? And I can't get a handle on that, so I have no foundation upon which I can base an objection.

I did make a few stabs at this. I asked some realtors to try to give me some understanding about what the proposed new building would do to my

property value and they couldn't come up with anything, so I just have to cast my fate upon the waters and see what happens down the road. But basically, if they will do the screening that they propose to do and they will protect me acoustically, I can't talk in terms of the aesthetics of the building or what it means to the area or what it means in terms of zoning. Those are purviews beyond my ability to make any logical conclusions.

So when Ι filed my original objection, it was a preliminary statement. I was property value concerned about and noise and I think I've gotten enough assurance to reverse my position in this respect. And as a matter of fact, recladding that building in a way would make the Hungarian building less like a fortification and more like something that fits in aesthetically, so I think that is a satisfactory move.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent statement and I appreciate that concluding remark.

The Board takes with great seriousness, the responsibility that you put upon us and that is to maintain your privacy and landscape screening and also to make sure that there is some noise attenuation and placement of the equipment that would reduce that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

1 impact on you. I think you're absolutely correct in 2 asserting that property value and land value is often 3 more moving target and one can't put a pen 4 essentially in what move it in one direction or the 5 So I appreciate your understanding of that. But the others, we take great seriousness in our 6 7 responsibility in assuring that levels of each be 8 addressed. Are there other questions for Dr. Sussman 9 10 at this time? 11 (No response.) 12 Very well, we do appreciate you being 13 patient with us and staying to provide that update of 14 your testimony and position. 15 Yes? MS. VURKOVIC: Honorable members of the 16 17 Board, my name is Nora, Dr. Nora Vurkovic and I'm here 18 to support the application. And a consular of the 19 Embassy of the Czech Republic. The chancery of the 20 embassy is located across the street from 21 Hungarian Embassy. 22 I'm here to, as I have told you, I am here 23 to express the support. Unfortunately, the Ambassador 24 is out of town, so I am here to express the support of

the Embassy of the Czech Republic for the case of the

Republic of Hungary in the matter discussed in this hearing.

We were invited or the Embassy of the Czech Republic was invited by the Office of Zoning to this meeting, to this hearing, because we are neighbors of the Hungarian Embassy. Our embassies are destined to cooperate closely. We are neighbors here in Washington, but geographically in Europe, we are also neighbors. We share the same history and we are fellow members of the European Union.

It's only natural that the Hungarian Embassy shared with us their plans to renovate the building and they, of course, showed us the project and the plans to develop. We are not architects or landscapers, so we cannot really evaluate this quality. We can only say that the building will be definitely effective, functional and definitely an asset and an improvement of the neighborhood.

But most of all, and the reason I am here on behalf of the Embassy is to witness before the Board the responsibility the Embassy of Hungary exercises towards the community here in Washington, the effort, the great care and also resources to comply with all the requirements. We learned all about the procedures needed to get here to this day,

1	to this hearing. So we are aware of their effort,
2	responsibility and care. We respect that and that is
3	the reason we are here and we want the Board to know
4	that the Embassy of the Czech Republic supports the
5	application.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you very much.
7	And do we have something from you in the record,
8	written?
9	MS. VURKOVIC: Unfortunately not. I
10	apologize. I was
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: It's not required.
12	MS. VURKOVIC: I was not aware of the
13	procedures, but I can provide it, of course. I can
14	provide you with the recommendation.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Why don't we have that
16	submitted in, a letter in support of the application,
17	if you wouldn't mind. Very well.
18	MS. VURKOVIC: Absolutely.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Are there others
20	present, persons who have testimony in support or in
21	opposition? This is Application 17481 of the FMBZA.
22	Not noting any others, thank you all very
23	much. We do appreciate it.
24	We don't have any other procedural
25	requirements for us today. Let us and Ms. Prince,

if you wouldn't mind coming forward -- let us set a schedule for this as we had laid out. We are going to need to assemble a few documents. The Board has discussed that briefly. Then we will set this for our deliberation and have the entire record provided to Ms. Gallagher for her participation in that.

I have in my notes that we are going to one, we've just indicated that we would leave the record open to receive the letter of support as indicated. I am also -- we will have Mr. Mlotek's submitting his letter from the State Department. There was some issue that was brought up, Mr. Parsons asking about the stormwater management plan and also how that might impact or revise the landscape plan. Brief comments on that.

Is that something we need in the record, Mr. Parsons, prior to moving ahead to deliberation? MR. PARSONS: think that's Yes, Ι important, it will also show where it's discharged into the streets.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay, so we're going to need a handle on the schedule when that might able to be discussed in the record. I know it was about a month that was indicated for. I believe that may have been final. I'm not sure we need absolute final plan

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	of that, but obviously a good design or more than a
2	concept, but a design plan that we might be able to
3	balance and impact.
4	MR. PARSONS: I was also interested in
5	getting a revised landscape plan on the Shoemaker
6	Street side of the chancery building without hurting
7	the elm tree or the roots of the elm tree, excuse me.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And that would be
9	revised to do what? What revisions are you looking to
10	
11	MR. PARSONS: The idea was to provide more
12	screening for the park across the street and new
13	architecture.
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I see. Okay.
15	Difficulties in setting this for decision in June the
16	6th, Ms. Prince? Any difficulties in assembling the
17	information requested Mr. Mlotek?
18	I'll hear from anybody that might have
19	difficulties? Yes.
20	MS. PRINCE: I believe that we can have
21	the stormwater management plan in two weeks, so if we
22	could be on the May agenda, that would be preferable.
23	Maybe that timing is too tight for you.
24	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Two weeks would get you
25	the stormwater management plan, but then we'd need to

1	have that inputted into the landscape plan, so you
2	could turn it all around in two weeks.
3	MS. PRINCE: Yes, we could.
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Are we getting the
5	transcript in two weeks, Mr. Mlotek?
6	Comments on that, May or June?
7	MR. MLOTEK: Mr. Chairman, I don't think
8	you mean the transcript, you mean the letter from the
9	
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right, I'm not asking
11	for you to comment on the transcript.
12	MR. MLOTEK: Sorry.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: On the decision whether
14	
15	MR. MLOTEK: You mean the letter of
16	support, the standard Department of State letter?
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You can make it by the
18	May decision meeting, is that correct?
19	MR. MLOTEK: Yes. And what date is that?
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: It would be the 2nd of
21	May.
22	MS. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, if it's
23	appropriate, we do need to get the transcript back and
24	give Ms. Gallagher a little time to read it, so Mr.
25	Parsons will be here on May 9th. I don't know if

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I have no difficulty with that. We could set it for special meeting on the 9th of May. Any scheduling problems with that? Excellent. Okay, let's do it. Let's just set a submission, Ms. Bailey, if you wouldn't mind. MS. BAILEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm showing that's right May 9th sorry, May 1st, sir, May 1st or May 2nd. Is that appropriate, Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule, procedures, yes?	1	that's a convenient time, but it's just something for
with that. We could set it for special meeting on the 9th of May. Any scheduling problems with that? Excellent. Okay, let's do it. Let's just set a submission, Ms. Bailey, if you wouldn't mind. MS. BAILEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm showing that's right May 9th sorry, May 1st, sir, May 1st or May 2nd. Is that appropriate, Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	2	consideration.
9th of May. Any scheduling problems with that? Excellent. Okay, let's do it. Let's just set a submission, Ms. Bailey, if you wouldn't mind. MS. BAILEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm showing that's right May 9th sorry, May 1st, sir, May 1st or May 2nd. Is that appropriate, Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I have no difficulty
Excellent. Okay, let's do it. Let's just set a submission, Ms. Bailey, if you wouldn't mind. MS. BAILEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm showing that's right May 9th sorry, May 1st, sir, May 1st or May 2nd. Is that appropriate, Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	4	with that. We could set it for special meeting on the
set a submission, Ms. Bailey, if you wouldn't mind. MS. BAILEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm showing that's right May 9th sorry, May 1st, sir, May 1st or May 2nd. Is that appropriate, Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	5	9th of May. Any scheduling problems with that?
MS. BAILEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm showing that's right May 9th sorry, May 1st, sir, May 1st or May 2nd. Is that appropriate, Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	6	Excellent. Okay, let's do it. Let's just
showing that's right May 9th sorry, May 1st, sir, May 1st or May 2nd. Is that appropriate, Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	7	set a submission, Ms. Bailey, if you wouldn't mind.
sir, May 1st or May 2nd. Is that appropriate, Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	8	MS. BAILEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	9	showing that's right May 9th sorry, May 1st,
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well, is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	10	sir, May 1st or May 2nd. Is that appropriate, Mr.
is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms. Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	11	Chairman?
Prince? MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, MS. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think I have well,
MS. PRINCE: yes. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	13	is there a possibility of getting it on the 27th, Ms.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that, Ms. Bailey. MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	14	Prince?
Ms. Bailey. Ms. Bailey: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	15	MS. PRINCE: yes.
MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I'd rather have that,
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay, anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	17	Ms. Bailey.
anything else then? Clarification on schedule,	18	MS. BAILEY: April 27th, sir? Okay.
	19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay,
21 procedures, yes?	20	anything else then? Clarification on schedule,
	21	procedures, yes?
MS. PRINCE: I just had some brief closing	22	MS. PRINCE: I just had some brief closing
remarks if I could indulge your patience.	23	remarks if I could indulge your patience.
24 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Fabulous. Absolutely.	24	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Fabulous. Absolutely.
MR. MLOTEK: Just before we move to that,	25	MR. MLOTEK: Just before we move to that,

1 just to clarify this, the submission date is not --2 submission date remains May 2nd in view of or --MR. PARSONS: April 27th. 3 4 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 27th is what I'd like 5 at 3 o'clock in the Office of Zoning, unless that's a I can push it to the second. 6 When we push 7 it to the 2nd, it's limiting the time of preparation for the member that was not here. 8 MR. MLOTEK: 9 Right. Okay. We'll do it. 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Excellent. 11 MS. PRINCE: Brief closing comments, and 12 I do appreciate your patience. This is an important project for the Republic of Hungary. It will provide 13 a long-needed renovation. It involves a generous 14 15 landscape plan, a whole new facade on the existing building and I believe it will greatly enhance the 16 17 appearance of the site. Just to reiterate, the existing square is 89 percent nonresidential use. 18 19 There's a total of 38,000 square feet of building area 20 in the square; 34,000 of it is non-residential. That 21 should alleviate some of your concerns about the 22 proposed use of Lot 3. 23 In terms of the tree and slope overlay 24 which is not yet in effect, we have done our very best

to comply with the overlay. The overlay, contrary to

what the ANC Commissioner said, the overlay requires 50 percent lot occupancy, I'm sorry, 50 percent impervious surface as a maximum. We're at 60 percent. We reduced our impervious surface area to address the spirit of the overlay and the 22 percent that was referenced, as you said, is the amount of area on the site that is not green.

We're very pleased to get you the additional post-hearing materials that you've requested. In terms of the landscape plan, we are putting back more inches of circumference than we are taking away. We are putting back 150 feet more inches of circumference of tree than we are taking away. thought that might be a helpful number for you.

And finally, sometimes these hearings are not just about what we hear, it's about what we don't hear. And this is a chancery case, yet we've not heard a single complaint about the operation of the Hungarian Embassy on this site for the past 30 years. We haven't heard what you usually hear in cases of this nature. We haven't heard about parking problems. We haven't heard about noise. We haven't heard about loud parties.

We've heard from the most immediately affected neighbor. He's not mentioned any adverse

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

impacts that flow from the operation of the chancery on the site. And I would urge you to take that into consideration as you evaluate the application and again, we thank you for your time.

Excellent. thank you very much, Ms. Prince. We do appreciate that, and all of the information you've already submitted into the record. And that that's been provided today.

One question, of course, that I'd like you to expound on in your conclusionary remarks is that the tree and slope overlay is not in effect yet. I'll give you an opportunity to address the Board. It's Ms. Prince's conclusion, so this will be the last word on this.

MS. SIMONS: Even if it's incorrect?

MS. PRINCE: The final rulemaking is not yet in effect. Under the setdown rule, the tree and slope overlay needs to be considered for permit applications governing this site and we have looked at that, but the final overlay is not in effect, the final rulemaking has not been adopted. There's a 2002 version that has been circulating for the past four years. The Commission took proposed action on yet a different version and that version has not been adopted by the Commission. That's my point.

T	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay, thank you very
2	much and we'll certainly look into that and appreciate
3	you bringing that up to our attention.
4	With that, I thank you all. We've
5	accomplished quite a bit, although it is after noon.
6	This would conclude the proceedings of the FMBZA at
7	this time and we will draw to conclusion.
8	With that, we're going to take just a five
9	minute break. At the end of five minutes I will call
10	to session our public hearing of the 11th of April.
11	I'll allow this Applicant to remove their information
12	and I would ask that the next on our schedule begin to
13	set up, so we can get directly into it.
14	(Whereupon, at 12:14 p.m., the hearing was
15	concluded.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	